

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
IN THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

KEVIN A . CRAIG #381110

Petitioner,

District Court No.

RECEIVED

217-CV-12380

V

AUG 07 2020

U.S. Court of Appeals No.

WARDEN O.T. WINN

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

Respondent,

Prose, MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT ORDER UNDER RULE 60 (b) (1)

Petitioner-Kevin Craig #381110

Saginaw Correctional Facility

9625 Pierce Rd.

Freeland. MI. 48623

1. Petitioner - Kevin A. Craig, is currently incarcerated at the Saginaw Correctional Facility in Freeland, Michigan. He filed a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 USC 2254, challenging his convictions of first-degree murder, MCL 750.316, assault with intent to commit murder, MCL 750.83, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, MCL 750.2276. The State Court sentenced him to life without parole for the first-degree murder, 40 to 80 years for the assault with intent to murder, and 2 years for the possession of a firearm offense. Pursuant to Rule 60 (b) (1), a petitioner brings this timely motion seeking this courts authority for petitioner to add a new ground for relief claiming that the issues raised in his habeas petition were adequate and deserve relief or encouragement to proceed further Slack V McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473,484 (2000). (citation omitted).

II. Background

Petitioners convictions arise from a fatal shooting that occurred in Detroit MI. Mr. Craig was improperly tried along with his co-defendant Donovan Young. But, the "summarized" statement of facts were mischaracterized and [Malum in Se].

A. Proposed Statement of Facts

On June 12, 2011, on Sorrento Street in Detroit, Michigan. (Fathers Day). Darnell Richardson suffered a nonfatal gunshot injury and Antonio Turner was shot three times and died on the scene. Richardson testified that he had encountered petitioner- Kevin Craig on the street and the two of them engaged in a conversation. Antonio Turner was

also present during this conversation. While the three of them were there, Richardson testifies that Donovan Young appeared, left and returned with a .357 caliber revolver and points it at Turners head and said "FUCK IT" and pulled the trigger, but the gun did not fire the first time. Richardson, yelled run to Turner, and Craig, Richardson and Tuner all started running, but as they were running heard gun shoots. Richardson claims he was shot, but did not see who or when he got shot. Turner was allegedly shot three times and died at the scene. A witness Barbara Ingram testified that she ducked for cover inside her home when the shooting started, but when she looked up, she saw (deceased) Turner on the ground. She did not see petitioner Craig shot anyone. Another witness Ariel Sydes testified that she only heard the shooting and saw a dark colored car pull up and a heavyset guy got out and shot Tuner and others chased Richardson during the turn of events.

Petitioner asserts that the state courts erred in denying his leave to appeal. People v Craig, No.333561 (Mich.ct. App. Sept. 30, 2016); People v Craig.500 Mich.1000 (Mich. May 31, 2017).Petitioner Craigs motion for relief from judgment Mich.Ct. Rule 6.508 (d) was erroneously denied, where Judge Bruce U Morrow alleged that Craig waived his right to a speedy trial, claiming that he was released on bond, but his motion for a bond was clearly denied. (See attachment A Opinion of Judge)

Therefore, in light of the extenuating circumstances, the trial court erred by presuming, that petitioner agreed through his defense attorney that he was willing to consolidate his trial with co-defendant Donovan Young even though Young was not charged until the month of petitioners trial. The state courts deliberate allegations severely prejudiced, Mr. Craig and denied him due process when their was never a hearing to provide factual evidence of these claims by the trial court*. These allegations appear to be disingenuously, unethical practices in an attempt to implicitly deny Craig from justice of the criminal justice system. Petitioner seeks such review [*coram nobis*].

111. Standard of Review

Habeas Corpus Petitions are governed by the Antiterrorism and effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"). Under the AEDPA, a state prisoner is entitled to a writ of habeas corpus if he can show that the state courts adjudication of his claims: (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law, as determined by the supreme Court of the United States; or (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceedings. See 28 U.S.C. 2254 (d).

B. Discussion

Consequently the state court proceedings were unreasonable by the presumptive allegations thereby denying petitioner Craig his constitutional rights of due process, right to a fair trial. U.S. Ams. 14 & 6.

In this instant case Craig has clearly established that the state courts erroneous determination has caused a "domino effect" that **implicitly** prejudiced him from deliberate presumptions of the evidence and facts.

In Gonzalez, the court dealt with whether AEDPA's restrictions on a second or successive habeas petition categorically barred a petitioners Rule 60 (b) motion seeking post-judgment relief. Our Supreme Court unanimously held that it does not See Id. at *8 (Scalia, J. for the Court).

In particular, the Supreme Court noted the following test for determining whether a Rule 60 (b) motion advances one or more "claims". [for habeas relief] will be relatively simple. A motion that seeks to "add a new ground" for [habeas relief]... will of course qualify. A motion can also be said to bring a "claim" if it attacks the federal courts previous resolutions on the merits, by establishing that the court erred in denying habeas relief on the merits is effectively indistinguishable from alleging that the movant is under substantive provisions of the statute, entitled to habeas relief. That is not the case, however, when a Rule 60 (b) motion attacks **not the substance of the federal courts resolution of a claim on the merits**, but some defect in the integrity of the

federal habeas proceedings. In this instant case, The state courts inadvertent mischaracterizations in their Opinion has "implicitly biased" petitioners from being granted relief shown in the district courts Order. Wherefore, Mr. Craig rebuts, the state courts decision which contradicts the federal and Supreme Courts cases. Puertas, 272 F Supp.2d. Under Gonzalez, the majority notes that "Rule 60 (b) remains viable in the habeas context only to the extent it is not inconsistent with AEDPA and other applicable federal statutory provisions and rules". See also Mitchell v Rees, 261 Fed. Appx. 825 (Jan 9, 2008).

Notably in this case, the district court abused its discretion abdicating its role in not reviewing issues of state law, which would have given extra ordinary weight for further review of all issues. When the district courts conclusion state that the "respondent", argues all but, one of petitioner claims are procedurally defaulted. Under the procedural default doctrine, a federal habeas court will not review a question of federal law if a state courts decision rest on substantive or procedural state law ground that is independent of the federal question and is adequate to support the judgment. See Coleman v Thompson, 501 U.S. 722,729 (1991). Petitioners claims were meritorious, but were inadvertently unaddressed, by the district court. When clearly the state courts violation of the jurisdictional bar [right to speedy trial] was applicable under the Sixth Amendment of the United State Constitution. Also See 28 2254 (d)(2).

Our supreme Court held: that courts must balance the following four factors in determining whether a defendants constitutional rights to a speedy trial has been violated:

(1) the length of the delay; (2) the reason for the delay; (3) the defendants assertion of his or her right to a speedy trial; and (4) prejudice to the defendant. *Barker v Wingo*, 407 U.S. 514,528 (1972).

[U]ntil there is some delay which is presumptively prejudicial there is no necessity for inquiry into the other facts that go into the balance". *Barker*, 407 U.S. at 530.

In this instant case it is clear from the record that he was denied his right to a speedy trial, when the trial was scheduled for January 10, 2012 and changed to April 14, 2012 See attachment B(Register of Actions Third Judicial Circuit of Michigan)

The trial courts intentional delay in order to deliberately consolidate Craigs trial with co-defendant, Donovan Young did violate petitioners right to a speedy trial. These persistent circumstances do render such a process ineffective to protect the rights of defendant. A delay that "approaches one year is presumptively prejudicial. *Doggett v United States* 505 U.S. 647, 652 n. 1 (1992).

Petitioner does argue that he was prejudice by the delay of the state consolidation of his trial that was set for January 10, 2012 which defendant was prepared to proceed with his defense witnesses. Unfortunately, in part to the delay Craigs witness tragically suffered a szisure and died before being able to testify for the new trial date in April.

Under the direct of circumstances, Craigs deliberately delayed trial prejudiced him. Thus a petitioner may rebut the **presumption with clear and convincing evidence**. 28 USC 2254 (e)(1).

The state courts decision as well as the district courts Order and Opinions Inadvertance clearly demonstrates defects in this petitioners claims, erroneously denying relief and or correcting judicial errors that has plagued petitioners necessary relief. United States v Bankston, 820 F. 3d 215, Before a federal court applies the procedural default doctrine to feffrain from considering a claims merits, the federal court must first determine whether the state court has plainly stated its reliance on procedural, as opposed to substantive law. Cooney v Anderson, 988 F. Supp. 1066 (1997) In this instant case the state court clearly relied on substative state laws. Undeniably,our federal laws and constitution holds higher authority and equity over state laws. Accordingly, the district court has not held a evidentiary hearing on this matter. to sufficiently show Mr. Craigs conviction and waiver is invalid. Johnson v United States, 520 U.S. 461, 466-68,69,117 S.ct. 1544,137 L.Ed. 2d 718 (1997) In such circumstances, the presumption that the federal claim was adjudicated on merits may be rebutted- either by the habeas petitioner (for the purpose of showing that the claims should be considered by the federal Court de novo) or by the state (for the purpose of showing tat the federal claim should be regarded as procedurally defaulted). Johnson v Williams, 568 U.S. 289, 133 S.Ct. 1088, 185 L.Ed 2d 105, 2013 U.S. LEXIS 1610, 81 U.S. L.W. 4096.

When a motion is brought under Rule 60 (b), that contains a claim which asserts a federal basis for relief from a state courts judgment of conviction seeking to add a new ground for relief or attacking a federal courts previous resolution of a claim on the merits it is not a second or successive habeas claims. Gonzalez v Crosby. 162 L.Ed. 2d 480 125, S.Ct. 2641, 2005 W L 1469516 (2005).

S U M M A R Y A N D R E L I E F R E Q U E S T E D

For all of the foregoing reasons petitioner requests
this Honorable Tribunal, GRANT said motion and allow him a
new ground for relief or reverse district courts determination,
and review state courts unreasonable determination of the facts
or whatever further proceeding this court deems necessary.

Respectfully Submitted,

7-30-20
Date

Kevin A. Craig #381110
Petitioner/ Kevin A. Craig #381110
Saginaw Correctional Facility
9625 Pierce Rd.
Freeland, MI 48623

RECEIVED

AUG 07 2020

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

ATTACHMENT
A

Bruce V. Morrow
OPINION
1-14-16

Defendant also claims his trial counsel was ineffective for allowing a violation of the 180 day rule in order to allow the prosecution to consolidate his and his co-defendant's trial. MCL 780.133 requires dismissal with prejudice if a prisoner is not brought to trial within the 180-day time limit set forth in the act: In the event that, within the time limitation set forth in section 1 of this act, action is not commenced on the matter for which request for disposition was made, no court of this state shall any longer have jurisdiction thereof, nor shall the untried warrant, indictment, information or complaint be of any further force or effect, and the court shall enter an order dismissing the same with prejudice. The 180-day-rule statute expressly provides that the Department of Corrections must deliver a written notice of incarceration and request for disposition "to the prosecuting attorney of the county in which the warrant, indictment, information, or complaint is pending" MCL 780.131(1); *People v. Fex*, 439 Mich 117, 119-123, 479 N.W.2d 625 (1992), aff'd 507 US 43, 113 S Ct 1085, 122 LEd2d 406 (1993). The 180-day period does not commence until the prisoner's request for final disposition of the charges against him or her have actually been delivered to the court and prosecuting officer of the jurisdiction that lodged the detainer against him or her. *People v. Williams*, 716 NW2d 208, 215, 475 Mich 245, 256 (2006).

Since defendant agreed through his defense attorney to consolidation, he has been deemed to have waived his right to a speedy trial. Waiver is the intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege. *People v. Grinnett*, 388

Bruce D. McCreaw
Opinion
1-14-16

Mich 590, 598, 202 NW2d 278 (1972), overruled on other grounds in *People v. White*, 390 Mich 245, 212 NW2d 222 (1973) overruled on other grounds in *People v. Nutt*, 469 Mich. 565, 677 NW2d 1 (2004). Waiver consists of (1) specific knowledge of the constitutional right and (2) an intentional decision to abandon the protection of the constitutional right. *Grimmett*, *supra* at 598, 202 NW2d 278. Moreover, this Court finds no merit in defendant's allegation because he was released on bond pending his trial date, which tolls the running of defendant's 180 day count. *People v. Williams*, 716 NW2d 208, 217, 475 Mich. 245, 260-61 (2006).

Next, defendant asserts his innocence, and argues he was denied a fair trial where the prosecutor failed to provide sufficient evidence to prove first degree murder. The statutory crime of first-degree premeditated murder is committed only if the defendant entertains the intent to kill. *People v. Garcia*, 398 Mich 250, 259, 247 NW2d 547 (1976). In addition, the intent to kill in first-degree premeditated murder must be deliberate and premeditated. *People v. Hansen*, 368 Mich 344, 351, 118 NW2d 422 (1962). "Premeditated means thought out beforehand or designed or planned. The killing must be the result of real and substantial reflection. "Deliberate means that the defendant must have considered the pros and cons of that design and have measured and chosen his actions. The intent must be formed by a mind that is free from undue excitement. This excludes acts done on a sudden impulse without reflection. "Willful means the intent to take a life. "For first-degree murder, there must be such a lapse of time as would give

ATTACHMENT

B

THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MICHIGAN
REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CASE NO. 11-010905-01-FC

State of Michigan v Kevin Craig

RECEIVED

AUG 07 2020

Location: Criminal Division
Morrow, Bruce U.
Judicial Officer:
Filed on: 10/26/2011
Case Number History: 11060968-01
11713755-01
11713755-01
Case Tracking Number: 1106120269
CRISNET/Incident No.:

CASE INFORMATION

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

Deg Date Case Type: Capital Felonies
Case 07/31/2015 Open Inactive

Offense
1. Homicide - Open Murder - Statutory Short Form
Filed As: Homicide - Murder First Degree -

Status: 7/1/2011
Case Flags: Habitual Offender
Case has PDF Electronic
Transcripts

Premeditated
Arrest: 06/13/2011
DPHOM - Detroit Pd Homicide

2. Assault With Intent to Murder
Arrest: 06/13/2011
DPHOM - Detroit Pd Homicide

3. Weapons - Firearms - Possession By Felon
Arrest: 06/13/2011
DPHOM - Detroit Pd Homicide

4. Weapons Felony Firearm
Arrest: 06/13/2011
DPHOM - Detroit Pd Homicide

Statistical Closures
04/19/2012 Jury Verdict

Warrants
Failure To Appear - Craig, Kevin (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.)
09/05/2011 Warrant Cancelled/Recalled (LC)

Fine: \$0
Bond: \$0

PARTY INFORMATION

Plaintiff State of Michigan

Lead Attorneys
Kaplan, Steven M.
(586) 574-0020(W)

Defendant Craig, Kevin
Black Male Height 5' 7" Weight 200
SID: M12090325X
Other Agency Number: 596421 Detroit Police Identification Number

Woodards, Clifford
Public Defender
(313) 333-4975(W)

STATE APPELLATE DEFENDER OFFICE

Appellate
Attorney

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

INDEX

DATE	EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT	INDEX
07/01/2011	Recommendation for Warrant	
07/01/2011	Habitual Offender	
07/01/2011	Warrant Signed	
09/05/2011	Arrangement on Warrant (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) Defendant Stands Mute; Plea Of Not Guilty Entered By Court	
09/05/2011	To Waive 14 Day Rule	
09/05/2011	Filed	
09/05/2011	Interim Condition for Craig, Kevin (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) - Remand	

THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MICHIGAN
REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CASE NO. 11-010905-01-FC

\$0.00

09/05/2011	Plea (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) 1. Homicide - Open Murder - Statutory Short Form Defendant Stand Mute: Plea of Not Guilty Entered by Court
09/05/2011	Plea (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) 2. Assault With Intent to Murder Defendant Stand Mute: Plea of Not Guilty Entered by Court
09/05/2011	Plea (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) 3. Weapons - Firearms - Possession By Felon Defendant Stand Mute: Plea of Not Guilty Entered by Court
09/05/2011	Plea (Judicial Officer: McDuffee, Renee R.) 4. Weapons Felony Firearm Defendant Stand Mute: Plea of Not Guilty Entered by Court
09/20/2011	CANCELED Preliminary Examination <i>Adjourned:At The Request Of The Court</i>
09/20/2011	Motion for a Continuance Filed/Signed
09/28/2011	CANCELED Preliminary Examination
10/26/2011	Preliminary Examination (Judicial Officer: Sanders, Brenda K.) <i>Held: Bound Over</i>
10/26/2011	Motion to Assign Counsel Filed/Signed
10/26/2011	Bound Over
10/26/2011	Motion to Dismiss a Charge
10/26/2011	Filed
10/26/2011	Motion to Amend the Information
10/26/2011	Filed
10/26/2011	Disposition (Judicial Officer: Sanders, Brenda K.) 3. Weapons - Firearms - Possession By Felon Dismissed
10/26/2011	Order For Production Of Exam Transcript Signed and Filed <i>Constance Grimes:10-26-11;0+1;</i>
11/08/2011	Stenographers Certificate Filed <i>Constance Grimes;</i>
11/02/2011	Arraignment On Information (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.) Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey Resource: Courtroom Clerk CS948 Parsons, Patricia <i>Held</i>
11/02/2011	Scheduled AOI

36 pages

THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MICHIGAN
REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CASE NO. 11-010905-01-FC

12/16/2011 Final Conference (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

01/05/2012 Pre-Trial (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5984 Marshall, Theresa
Held

01/05/2012 Heard And Denied (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Motion to consolidate

01/10/2012 ~~Pre-Trial~~ ^{Pre-Trial}
Motion To Consolidate
MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE WITH CASE #11-12797, GRANTED

01/11/2012 *CANCELED Jury Trial*
Adjourned: At The Request Of The Court

01/12/2012 Pre-Trial (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

01/12/2012 Refer To Pre-Trial Services For a Bond Review (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
DUE DATE 1/20/12 BOND TYPE: Remand BOND AMOUNT: \$0.00

01/20/2012 Motion Hearing (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Adjourned at the Request of the Court

01/27/2012 Motion Hearing (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

01/27/2012 Motion (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
DEFENSE MOTION TO SET A BOND, DENIED

02/10/2012 Final Conference (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

04/13/2012 Pre-Trial (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

04/16/2012 Jury Trial (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)
Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
In Progress

THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MICHIGAN
REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CASE NO. 11-010905-01-FC

04/17/2012 **Jury Trial in Progress** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

04/18/2012 **Jury Trial in Progress** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
In Progress

04/19/2012 **Jury Trial in Progress** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

04/19/2012 **Disposition** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

1. Homicide - Open Murder - Statutory Short Form
Found Guilty by Jury
2. Assault With Intent to Murder
Found Guilty by Jury
4. Weapons Felony Firearm
Found Guilty by Jury

04/19/2012 Found Guilty By Jury (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

04/19/2012 Refer to Probation For Pre-Sentence Report (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

04/19/2012 Order For DNA Sample (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

04/19/2012 Motion For A Directed Verdict Of Not Guilty (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

DENIED

05/04/2012 **Sentencing** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

Resource: Court Rpt/Rec 37 Goldsmith, Jeffrey
Resource: Courtroom Clerk C5948 Parsons, Patricia
Held

05/04/2012 **Sentence** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

4. Weapons Felony Firearm

Prison Sentence

State Confinement:

Agency: Michigan Department of Corrections

Effective 05/04/2012

Term: 2 Yr to 2 Yr

Credit for Time Served: 245 Days

Fee Totals:

- Standard FEL

Fees (ATTY,

SMCF, JCVF)

Fee Totals \$

743.00
743.00

05/04/2012 **Sentence** (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)

2. Assault With Intent to Murder

Prison Sentence




State Confinement:

Agency: Michigan Department of Corrections

Effective 05/04/2012

Term: 480 Mo to 960 Mo

THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MICHIGAN
REGISTER OF ACTIONS
CASE NO. 11-010905-01-FC

05/04/2012	Sentence (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.) 1. Homicide - Open Murder - Statutory Short Form Prison Sentence State Confinement: Agency: Michigan Department of Corrections Effective 05/04/2012 Term: Natural Life	
05/04/2012	Sentenced to Prison (Judicial Officer: Callahan, Michael J.)	
06/14/2012	Order For Production Of Trial And Sentence Transcript <i>jeffrey goldsmith 4/16, 17, 18, 19/12 jt, 5/4/12 se</i>	
06/14/2012	Stenographer Certificate Required	
06/18/2012	Stenographers Certificate Filed <i>jeffrey goldsmith; 4/16, 17, 18, 19/12; 5/4/12</i>	
08/02/2012	 Notice of Transcript Filed <i>Jeffrey Goldsmith; 4-16, 17, 18, 19, 5-4-12; E*</i>	Vol./Book 5 477 pages
06/14/2012	Appointment for Claim of Appeal (Circuit)	
07/16/2012	Order For Production Of Transcript <i>jeffrey goldsmith 11/2/11 aot, 12/16/11fc, 1/5, 12/12 pre trial, 1/27/12 mh, 2/10/12 jc</i>	
07/16/2012	Stenographer Certificate Required	
07/18/2012	Stenographers Certificate Filed <i>Per reporter Jeffrey Goldsmith, there is no record to be transcribed for 02-10-12.</i>	
07/18/2012	Stenographers Certificate Filed <i>jeffrey goldsmith; 11/2/11; 12/16/11; 1/5/12; 1/12/12; 1/27/12. there is no record to be transcribed for 2/10/12.</i>	
08/02/2012	 Notice of Transcript Filed <i>Jeffrey Goldsmith; 11-2, 12-16-11, 1-5, 12, 27-12; E**</i>	Vol./Book 5 34 pages
10/11/2012	Order For Production Of Transcript <i>Jeffrey Goldsmith PT 4/13/2012</i>	
10/11/2012	Stenographer Certificate Required	
10/12/2012	Stenographers Certificate Filed <i>jeffrey goldsmith; 4/13/12</i>	
10/16/2012	 Notice of Transcript Filed <i>Jeffrey Goldsmith; 04-13-12; E* Copy only, original filed with case 11-12797.</i>	Vol./Book 1 14 pages
07/29/2014	Application For Leave To Appeal (Circuit) <i>DENIED.</i>	
07/31/2015	Motion For Relief From Judgment <i>in pro per.</i>	
10/30/2015	Post Conviction (Judicial Officer: Morrow, Bruce U.) <i>Review status of MFR filed in pro per on July 31, 2014.</i>	

RECEIVED

AUG 07 2020

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

ATTACHMENT

B

